

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-20 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1 and 12 are independent. In the Office Action dated May 15, 2006, Claims 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Following this response, Claims 1-20 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action dated May 15, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 14-20 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,745,229 ("Gobin"). Claims 1 and 12 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "breaking sentences in the electronic document into words, and comparing the words to contents of a numerical search table, the contents of a numerical search table being user specified and configured to define the type of

numerical data to be located in the electronic document, the type of numerical data to be located specified by the numerical search table comprising at least one of the following: arabic numbers, cardinal numbers expressed as strings, ordinal numbers, roman numbers, and currency symbols.” Amended Claim 12 includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 7, lines 9-23 and page 8, line 30.

In contrast, *Gobin* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Gobin* merely discloses a system that may enable customers to sum up numerical figures, such as minutes and charges, by highlighting the numbers directly on the screen displaying the document. (See col. 2, lines 34-36.) Accordingly, *Gobin*’s dynamic accumulator functionality may provide mechanisms for obtaining totals or subtotals of numerical figures shown on a displayed document. (See col. 2, lines 34-36.) Consequently, comparing words from a document to user specified contents of a numerical search table configured to define the type of numerical data to be located in the electronic document is not disclosed in *Gobin*. Much less does *Gobin* disclose the type of numerical data to be located specified by the numerical search table comprising arabic numbers, cardinal numbers expressed as strings, ordinal numbers, roman numbers, or currency symbols. Rather *Gobin* merely discloses obtaining numerical figure totals or subtotals.

Furthermore, *Gobin* merely discloses that to add figures, a customer may click on one bucket and double click on, for example, the FIGS. 848a to be added. (See col. 18, lines 58-60.) Consequently, *Gobin* has a user highlight numerical terms in a document rather than this being determined in accordance with a specified numerical type. In

other words, it is the user that finds the numbers to be added on a screen. A determination is not made by an application in *Gobin*.

Gobin does not anticipate the claimed invention because *Gobin* at least does not disclose “breaking sentences in the electronic document into words, and comparing the words to contents of a numerical search table, the contents of a numerical search table being user specified and configured to define the type of numerical data to be located in the electronic document, the type of numerical data to be located specified by the numerical search table comprising at least one of the following: arabic numbers, cardinal numbers expressed as strings, ordinal numbers, roman numbers, and currency symbols,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 12 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 12 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 12.

Dependent Claims 2-11 and 13-20 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 12, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-11 and 13-20.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other

elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 15, 2006

By: 

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946
Telephone: 404.954.5066

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

DKS:mdc